REMARKS

In response to the action, Applicants have amended claims 1, 3 and 4 and cancelled claims 13 to 19. In addition, Applicants filed two terminal disclaimers to obviate the outstanding double patenting rejections. Applicants respectfully request reconsideration in view of the amendment, the terminal disclaimers and the following remarks.

Applicants' attorney thanks the Examiner for the telephone interview of June 28, 2007. During the interview, Applicants' attorney discussed various claim options, such as pH and defining the quaternary ammonium salt to distinguish the references. The parties did not reach any agreement with respect to patentability of the invention during the interview.

Applicants amended claim 1 to include all the specific imine derivatives listed in claims 1 and 4 and eliminated the superfluous language concerning formamidine and guanidine for clarity. Furthermore, the claims now include the form "selected from...or mixtures thereof" for consistency. In addition, these claims now define radicals R_2, R_3 and R_4 with the same limitations as R_1. The specification at paragraph 49 provides a basis for the limitation. In addition, claim 4 contains amendments for consistency with claim 1, as amended. Applicants respectfully submit that these amendments enter no new matter.

The action objects to claim 1 for the confusing grouping language. In an effort to streamline claim 1, amended claim 1 now only lists specific imine compounds. Applicants respectfully submit that amended claim 1 is sufficiently clear.

The action rejects claims 1 to 4 and 11 under 35 U.S.C. § 112, second paragraph, as being indefinite for failing to particularly point out and claim the invention. Amending claim 1 to include the imine derivative format and to include the specific imine derivatives of claim 4

eliminates the issue of specific imine derivatives also being a salt. Applicants respectfully submit that the claims are sufficiently clear, as amended.

Claims 1 to 4 and 11 were provisionally rejected under the judicially created doctrine of obviousness-type double patenting in view of Application No. 10/830,268. Applicants have filed a terminal disclaimer to obviate the rejection. Applicants respectfully submit that the terminal disclaimer renders the rejection moot.

Claims 1 to 4 and 11 were provisionally rejected under the judicially created doctrine of obviousness-type double patenting in view of Application No. 10/670,587. Applicants have filed a terminal disclaimer to obviate the rejection. Applicants respectfully submit that the terminal disclaimer renders the rejection moot.

The action rejects claims 1 to 4 and 11 under 35 U.S.C. § 103(a) as being obvious over Wang et al. (US Pat. Pub. No. 2003/0170991). Paragraph 27 discloses quaternary amines and specifically quaternary ammonia salts. Furthermore, paragraph 29 discloses a quaternary ammonium salt with two methyl groups. Unlike the methyl-containing formulation of Wang et al., Applicants' formulation relies upon the quaternary ammonium salt with each radical containing at least two carbon atoms to accelerate TEOS removal. Furthermore, the quaternary ammonium salts of Wang et al. function to stop polishing on tantalum or tantalum nitride. This is the opposite of the claimed invention that functions to remove barrier layers in the presence of low-K dielectrics, such as CDO. Thus, since Wang et al. fail to disclose or suggest the claimed quaternary ammonium salt useful for accelerating TEOS removal, Applicants respectfully submit that the claimed invention, as amended, is not obvious in view of the cited reference.

The action rejects claims 1 to 4 and 11 under 35 U.S.C. § 103(a) as being obvious over Lee et al. '834 in view of Wang et al. Lee et al. '834 lack a disclosure of the claimed quaternary

ammonium salt. As discussed above, Wang et al. disclose a quaternary ammonium salt with two methyl groups. Unlike the methyl-containing formulation of Wang et al., Applicants' formulation relies upon the quaternary ammonium salt with each radical containing at least two carbon atoms to accelerate TEOS removal. Furthermore, the quaternary ammonium salts of Wang et al. function to stop polishing on tantalum or tantalum nitride. This is the opposite of the claimed invention that functions to remove barrier layers in the presence of low-K dielectrics, such as CDO. Thus, since the combined references fail to disclose or suggest the claimed quaternary ammonium salt useful for accelerating TEOS removal, Applicants respectfully submit that the claimed invention, as amended, is not obvious in view of the cited references.

Applicants respectfully request reconsideration in view of the amendment, terminal disclaimers and arguments presented. If a telephone call will expedite prosecution, please call me at (302) 283-2136.

Respectfully submitted,

July 2, 2007
Date

Blake T. Biederman
Attorney for Applicant(s)
Reg. No. 34124

Blake T. Biederman
Patent Attorney
451 Bellevue Road
Newark, DE 19713
Tel.302 283-2136